

Rollins College

Rollins Scholarship Online

The College of Liberal Arts Faculty Minutes

College of Liberal Arts Minutes and Reports

9-23-1974

Minutes, College of Arts & Sciences Faculty Meeting, September 23, 1974

Arts & Sciences Faculty

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarship.rollins.edu/as_fac

Recommended Citation

Arts & Sciences Faculty, "Minutes, College of Arts & Sciences Faculty Meeting, September 23, 1974" (1974). *The College of Liberal Arts Faculty Minutes*. 286.
https://scholarship.rollins.edu/as_fac/286

This Minutes is brought to you for free and open access by the College of Liberal Arts Minutes and Reports at Rollins Scholarship Online. It has been accepted for inclusion in The College of Liberal Arts Faculty Minutes by an authorized administrator of Rollins Scholarship Online. For more information, please contact rwalton@rollins.edu.

ROLLINS COLLEGE

MEMORANDUM

September 10, 1974

From: Secretary of the Faculty

To: Rollins College Faculty
President, Student Association

Copy to: Public Relations Office (Box 13)

Subject: Faculty Meeting

1. The Fall Term meeting of the Rollins College Faculty will be held Monday, September 23, 1974 in HAUCK AUDITORIUM at 4:00 p.m.
2. Agenda will include:
 - I. Approval of minutes
 - II. Announcements and Reports
 - A. Dr. DeNicola
 - B. Dr. Critchfield
 - C. Provost Ling
 - D. Dr. Cohen (Chairman, Faculty Evaluation Review Committee)
 - E. Dr. Danowitz (Status of proposal, College Governance)
 - III. Business
 - A. Proposed changes to Bylaws--Standing Committee on Professional Standards and Ethics (See Attachment 1)--Dr. Backscheider
 - B. Proposed changes in "Statement of Policy on Faculty Evaluation"--Standing Committee on Professional Standards and Ethics (See Attachment 2)--Dr. Backscheider
 - IV. Other business
 - V. Adjournment

E. F. Danowitz

Attachments:

1. Proposed changes to Rollins College Bylaws
2. Proposed changes to "Statement of Policy on Faculty Evaluation"

September 10, 1974

RESOLVED, That the following changes to ARTICLE X, FACULTY EVALUATION of the Rollins College Bylaws (JUNE 1974) be adopted:

Section 1. B (1) a)

delete "... who shall serve as, or appoint, the chairman";

Section 1. B (3)

change sentence 2 to read "He shall be appointed by the Provost to a two-year term, and shall be selected from the candidate's department."

Section 2. B (3)

change sentence 1 to read "Tenure may not be awarded or denied until the candidate has completed the minimum probationary period."

Section 3. A

change to read "It is the responsibility of the Provost to serve as chairman or appoint a chairman for such committee meetings as are necessary, and to supply the information to the committee as directed in the Statement of Policy on Faculty Evaluation."

Section 3. F

change sentence 2 to read "The candidate shall have the right to respond in person or in writing to the committee documents; his response must be taken into consideration by the committee before submitting reports, drafts thereof, and recommendations to the President."

RESOLVED, That the following changes to the STATEMENT OF POLICY ON FACULTY EVALUATION be adopted:

- (1) Page 1 CHANGE: "to organize, articulate, and clarify knowledge or skill and show their relevance";

 TO READ: "to organize, articulate, and clarify knowledge or skill";
- (2) Page 3 CHANGE: "The evaluation, therefore, of faculty advising upper-classmen should be judged by the ability to function within the programs established by the department and the College."

 TO READ: "The evaluation, therefore, of faculty advising should be judged by the ability to function within the programs established by the department and the College."
- (3) Page 3 DELETE: "Because of changes now in progress in the freshman program, a definitive statement on evaluation of advising cannot now be made; until such time, therefore, the evaluation of freshmen advisers should be done through the channels established for the evaluation of teaching in the program; the Director of Freshman studies, and/or the Chief Academic Officer."
- (4) Page 5 CHANGE: "9 Administrative responsibility.
This includes, regardless of released time or extra compensation, such work as:

 - a. head of a department;
 - b. chairman of a division;
 - c. chairman or director of a foundation course;
 - d. special services or direction of special programs."

 TO READ: "9 Administrative responsibility.
This includes, regardless of released time or extra compensation, such work as:

 - a. head of a department;
 - b. chairman of a division;
 - c. directors of special programs."
- (5) Page 8 CHANGE: "Assistant professors with the doctorate may be promoted to the rank of associate professor after a minimum of four years full-time teaching in a senior institution in the lower rank, of which two years must at this institution, ... etc."

 TO READ: "Assistant professors with the doctorate may be promoted to the rank of associate professor after a minimum of four years full-time teaching in a senior institution in the lower rank, of which two years must be at this institution, ... etc."

(6) Page 9 CHANGE: "The Chief Academic Officer shall be responsible for convening the evaluation committee to consider promotion, as provided by Article X, Section 1 A (3) of the Faculty Bylaws."

TO READ: "The Provost shall be responsible for convening the evaluation committee to consider promotion, as provided by the College Bylaws."

(7) Page 9 CHANGE: "Associate professors with the doctorate may be promoted to professor after a minimum of five years full-time experience in a senior institution in the lower rank, of which three years must be at this institution, and on recommendation of the Department Head and the Chief Academic Officer to the President ... etc."

TO READ: "Associate professors with the doctorate may be promoted to professor after a minimum of five years full-time experience in a senior institution in the lower rank, of which three years must be at this institution, and on recommendation of the Evaluation Committee, the Department Head, and the Provost to the President, ... etc."

(8) Page 11 CHANGE: "Subject to exceptional circumstances to be determined by the Board of Trustees, administration, and faculty, beginning at the date of this statement and specifically non-retroactive, tenure will not be granted to any faculty, ... etc."

TO READ: "Subject to exceptional circumstances to be determined by the Board of Trustees, administration, and faculty, beginning at the date of this statement (adopted May 15, 1972) and specifically non-retroactive, tenure will not be granted to any faculty, ... etc."

(9) Page 13 CHANGE: "It is assumed that not only will the criteria relative to effective teaching, reappointment, promotion, tenure, or any combination of these will have been met in a superior manner, ... etc."

TO READ: "It is assumed that not only the criteria relative to effective teaching, reappointment, promotion, tenure, or any combination of these have been met in a superior manner, ... etc."

(10) Page 14 CHANGE: "Because of normal and other changes in faculty, a long-term policy on reappointments of department heads cannot be made, the general guidelines, ... etc."

TO READ: "Because of normal and other changes in faculty, a long-term policy on reappointments of department heads cannot be made; the general guidelines, ... etc."

(11) Page 15 DELETE: "(5) Foundation Course chairmen, when relevant";

MEMORANDUM

ROLLINS COLLEGE

From: Secretary of the Faculty

26 September 1974

To: All Faculty Members
President, Rollins College Student Association

Copy: Public Relations Office (Box 13)

Subject: Fall Term Faculty Meeting, minutes of

1. The Fall Term meeting of the Rollins College Faculty was held Monday, September 23, 1974 at Hauck Auditorium. All members of the Faculty were present except for the following:

Mr. Dale F. Amlund
Mr. Alexander Anderson
Dr. Wesley E. Blamick
Dr. John J. Bowers
Dr. Carol Burnett
Mr. Alphonse Carlo
Dr. Theodore Darrah
Ms. Josephine Dickson
Mr. Wilbur Dorsett
Dr. Charles M. Edmondson
Ms. Patricia K. Gregory
Ms. Hallie Lu Hallam
Dr. Herbert Hellwege
Mr. Gordon Howell

Dr. Charles Jorgensen
Mr. Joseph Justice
Dr. Michael S. Kahn
Mr. Ronald Larned
Mr. William McNulty
Mr. Harry Meisel
Mr. Ronald Pease
Dr. Pedro A. Pequeno
Mr. Thomas Peterson
Dr. Frank Sedwick
Dr. James W. Small
Dr. David Smith
Dr. Ward Woodbury
Mr. Charles Zellers

2. The following is a record of the meeting.

The minutes of the meeting of May 14, 1974 were approved with the addition of the names of Mr. Brockman, Dr. Hellwege, Dr. Gallo, Dr. Pequeno and Dr. Hicks attending.

Dr. DeNicola directed that discussions at all faculty meetings be kept within the limits of the question under consideration and asked that members remain present for the entire meeting. He complimented the chairmen of the Standing Committees for written reports issued and assured that time would be available prior to adjournment for Faculty to question the chairmen, as desired. Announcement was made of the following new Committee Chairmen:

College Activities Committee - Mr. Alan Nordstrom
Professional Standards and Ethics Committee - Dr. Paula Backscheider
Academic Standards Committee - Dr. Robert Ridgway
Academic Objectives Committee - Dr. Jack Lane
Graduate Council - Dr. Marshall Wilson

Dr. DeNicola further stated that through an oversight the 1974 College Bylaws contained an omission from the third sentence, last paragraph, page 31, and directed that the Bylaws read " ... necessary by the President of the College, President of the Faculty...." Since this was a clerical error no action was required by the Faculty.

Dr. DeNicola announced for Dean Pease that the Faculty were invited to use the living room and adjacent offices of the French House for meetings of special interest groups. Scheduled use of these facilities could be arranged through Sister Kathleen Gibney.

George Larsen was requested to, and detailed the appropriate procedure for submitting donations to the Book-A-Year Memorial Fund in memory of Eric A. Sedwick.

Dr. DeNicola announced that a statistical profile of the incoming freshman class, prepared by Mr. Hartog, Director of Admissions, was available. He also announced his feeling of good communication between Faculty and Administration as a result of his meetings with Administrative officers throughout the summer and early fall. He expressed confidence that there will be good inter-relationship between Faculty and Administration in regard to long-range planning; Faculty to have immediate and serious involvement in establishing these plans.

By consent of those present, it was agreed to change the agenda to take action on Items IIIA and IIIB as the first order of business. Dr. Backscheider explained that the proposed changes in IIIA were to establish uniformity in the Bylaws and moved that the motion be adopted. Mr. Chourou moved that the motion be amended to insert in Section 3F the following: " ... If the candidate wishes to respond to any points in his Committee he must do so in writing and MAY do so in person...." Dr. Ling seconded this amendment and it was passed. Dr. Backscheider's motion was then passed as amended.

Dr. Backscheider then proposed changes in the "Statement of Policy on Faculty Evaluation" and moved that the proposal be adopted. The motion was passed as introduced.

Dr. Critchfield then made his Fall Report to the Faculty. His remarks were geared to four phases: summary of what happened in 1973-1974; things that were and were not accomplished; this year as we see it now; and the future as we see it. The complete remarks of President Critchfield are available on tape at the Mills Memorial Library.

Dr. Ling reiterated in his report that he felt the College got off to a good start. He thanked the Faculty for the fine effort in advisory capacities, in that the student body indicated they were made to feel welcome and that even transfer students felt they were an integral part of the College student body. Dr. Ling also stressed that materials have been sent out for Winter Term and that he would not be tolerant of faculty members who did not support the objectives of the Winter Term.

Dr. Norris announced that Dr. George Rousseau would be a McCollough Lecturer and urged attendance at his lecture on Wednesday, September 25, at 7:30 in Bush Auditorium.

A brief question and answer period followed regarding the President's and Provost's reports.

Dr. Cohen presented the report of the Faculty Evaluation Review Committee. Complete copy of this report is appended as attachment 1 and made a part of these Minutes. President Critchfield expressed his complete concurrence with the report.

After very brief discussion by some Faculty members who expressed concern as to how the reduction of Faculty would take place (as stated in President Critchfield's report), Dr. Ling assured the Faculty that any reduction in Faculty would be in compliance with the AAUP guidelines, and with the Rollins College Bylaws which were even more restrictive.

Dr. Danowitz reported that a concept for a new form of College governance has been drafted. Copies of the concept were available to Faculty at the meeting and additional copies may be obtained from the Secretary upon request. Action on the proposal was deferred until the Winter Term Faculty meeting.

The meeting adjourned at 5:55 p.m.

E. F. Danowitz

Attachment (1) Report of Chairman, Faculty Evaluation Review Committee

lj:9/26/74

8

REPORT OF CHAIRMAN, FACULTY EVALUATION REVIEW COMMITTEE

The Faculty Evaluation Review Committee was established in the spring of 1972 when the current Article X was added to the Bylaws of the College. Its responsibilities are set forth in Section 3, subsection H of that article. Any candidate for reappointment or--presumably--promotion or tenure may appeal the final recommendations of his departmental evaluation committee to the Faculty Evaluation Review Committee, and this committee--after considering the candidate's statement of the grounds for his appeal, after examining the data, report, and recommendations of his evaluation committee, and after interviewing members of the College community--sends its recommendations to the President.

Last year the members of the Faculty Evaluation Review Committee, representing their respective divisions and duly elected by the College Senate, were Professors Cochran, Edmondson, and Gawlikowski, and myself. Last year two faculty members appealed the final recommendations of their departmental evaluation committees. I have asked for a few minutes of this meeting to impart some of our general observations of faculty evaluation at Rollins College.

First, it is clear that in many cases after a new faculty member has arrived at Rollins, there is surprisingly little concern for his professional improvement, development, and well-being; if he fits the prescribed mold of his department, "seems" to be adjusting to Rollins' expectations of him, and is not the subject of violent student opinion, then he is thought to be making satisfactory progress toward promotion and tenure. In many cases the evaluation process is merely perfunctory. A meeting is convened, the candidate is introduced to his committee, a few innocuous questions are raised, and the meeting is adjourned. In some cases there is evidence that no meeting even takes place. In one case, a faculty member is known to have asked his department head and colleagues for advice, for encouragement, for some evaluation beyond the routine "we unanimously recommend . . .," and the response was apparently a series of shrugs.

Second, it is evident to the Faculty Evaluation Review Committee that the departmental evaluation committees are, as a general rule, poorly prepared when they convene to draft their reports. There is every indication that faculty members are being reappointed, promoted, and granted tenure on the bases of the most cursory examination of student evaluations and faculty inventories, and vaguely perceived notions of their "general adaptability" to the goals of the College. There seems to be no effort at acquiring firsthand knowledge of a candidate's teaching abilities. Most department heads do not visit their colleague's classes on the grounds that such an action could constitute a violation of academic freedom. Yet, for the last three years the President has announced his intention to drop in on selected classes, and there has not been a single murmur of dissent, much less an expression of concern for academic freedom. Periodic visitations in a spirit of advice and encouragement could do no harm, we believe, and they may well help to correct some deficiency at the beginning of a teaching career. Every member of every evaluation committee has a responsibility to know the candidate and to have reviewed his student evaluations, but in most

cases there is an almost total dependence on what information the department head and the provost can provide.

Third, the Faculty Evaluation Review Committee is forced to conclude that the faculty does not know or understand the evaluation procedures set forth in Article X, Section 3 of the Bylaws and in the Statement of Policy on Faculty Evaluation. In many cases department heads have failed to solicit evaluative statements in writing from all members of their departments. And in some instances the draft report of the departmental evaluation committee's recommendations has been considered the final report and has been submitted to the President prior to the candidate's opportunity to respond to it. According to the Bylaws, X,3, F, "A draft of the committee report and recommendations shall be presented to the candidate at least two weeks prior to the deadline for submission /to the President/. The candidate shall have the right to respond in person or in writing to the committee documents; his response must be taken into consideration by the committee before submitting its report and recommendations to the President." Now this is an important issue. If a departmental committee should find itself obligated to include some critical statement in its evaluation of a candidate, then the candidate should have the right to respond, to explain, possibly to refute that statement prior to the President's reading it. A committee alleged recently that a candidate had required so many textbooks for a course that his students' budgets were severely strained. The candidate responded--after this charge and others had reached the President--that the total cost of his books for the course was less than \$12. Surprisingly, the committee did not bother to check the veracity of the response with the bookstore, or even to expunge its false allegation from the final report. There must be a willingness to evaluate candidates with candor and with objectivity, and strictly according to the procedures set forth in our Bylaws.

Fourth, and this is a very sad commentary, it is the conclusion of the Faculty Evaluation Review Committee that some evaluations are characterized by pettiness and backstabbing, and that a few candidates have been treated like pawns in power struggles between members or cliques in feuding departments. A member of one evaluation committee initiated a discussion of a candidate's ongoing evaluation at a department meeting--a terrible breach of confidence. On another occasion, an administrator who had no firsthand knowledge of a candidate's teaching ability urged an evaluation committee to vote against reappointment on the basis of hearsay evidence. And in another case, a member of a committee solicited student opinions of a faculty member by telephone, after midnight, and then listed the negative responses in the committee's report without specifying how and how many students were contacted, how many students' opinions were represented in the list, or how many favorable responses, if any, were received.

The Faculty Evaluation Review Committee is not a vigilante committee. We never felt that it was our responsibility to save a faculty member from the cruel world of the current job market. When damning evidence of teaching deficiencies seemed to be valid, we recognized our obligation to recommend that validity to the President. We were not in a position to do a better job of evaluating the teaching abilities of our colleagues than were the committees themselves. Consequently, as our deliberations unfolded, we found ourselves in the unappealing position of having to evaluate your evaluations. We did not make any friends in the process.

Moreover, because the Faculty Evaluation Review Committee could not know more about a candidate's teaching than did his evaluation committee, we were confronted with the task of deciding what should be the nature of our recommendations to the President. We set about to determine, first, if the candidate's departmental evaluation committee had conducted his evaluation according to the procedures outlined in the Bylaws, and, second, if within the framework of the Bylaws and the Statement of Policy on Faculty Evaluation, his committee had discharged its responsibilities. These determinations then were reported to the President, recommended to his attention, to aid him in the decisions that are rightly his to make. In our deliberations we were often chagrined to learn that certain of our determinations regarding violations of the Bylaws were labeled by candidates, committees, and recipients of our reports as "mere technicalities." No member of the Faculty Evaluation Review Committee or of this faculty would wish to have a poor teacher reappointed as a consequence of a violation of the Bylaws. But to characterize such violations as "mere technicalities" is to undermine the value and the validity of the laws by which we govern ourselves here at Rollins. They, after all, are our rights.

Finally, let me emphasize the fact that the particular cases that came before us on appeal last year were not unique in the type of problems they presented but only in the degree; in fact, even the best evaluations being conducted here contain the seeds of a possible appeal. I would like to admonish the faculty to consider these observations and to decide right now, while there are colleagues here who have been teaching only two weeks, what kind of evaluations we are going to perform in their behalf--and our own. It frightens me to think what will happen if we abuse the right to self-evaluation so much that we lose it.